

Global informational society: questions and perspectives (the problem of information systems as ideal models of interpersonal communication)

Elena Pavlova^{1,1}, *Irina Paliy*²

¹ Rostov State University of Economics (RSUE), Faculty of trade, Russia

² Rostov State University of Economics (RSUE), Faculty of trade, Russia

Abstract. The modern world is firmly connected with the phenomenon of globalization. In fact, globalization means a new stage in the historical development of society, where the economic, political and cultural interaction of the countries of the modern world is becoming more intense and profound. The method of temporal analysis and the method of personalistic and ideal-typical reconstruction, a tool that is adequate to the author's interpretation of inter-personal understanding in the era of globalization as a process of constituting the temporal and ethical dominance of individuals and collectivities that formalize the integrity of the cultural epoch, will become the immediate, applied methodological basis. The article deals with the phenomenon of social understanding, as important interaction between individuals in the global modern society through the analysis of information systems and inter-machine communication. The authors are convinced that as a result of all these processes we can speak about principal new level of individual relationship. In our opinion, information communication systems created by people are the ideal communication model for the future society. The article is devoted to for the inter-personal understanding in the future society based on information systems.

1 Introduction

According to outstanding thinkers of our time, both domestic, and foreign, the modern mankind has closely approached that moment to step in a qualitatively new condition [1] (for example, just imagine the transition from red to triangular – and you will understand what I mean). It is still a question what this new condition will be like. Many concepts and categories gradually lose their substantial value. The mankind faces necessity of development of new norms again. [2] The human being has lived in invariable, cyclic conditions. His life experience has been reproduced again and again, scooping stability and comfort in invariable realities of the existence. We have no time to follow all technological novelties - when we

¹Corresponding author: pavlova@philosophical.ru, palir@list.ru

buy one fashionable toy, through of some time we understand that it is already obsolete. We have no time to get timely education - knowledge which we receive in the educational institutions, become outdated by the moment when we graduate from them. [3]

“Nobody understands me”, “I say one thing, and people hear another thing!” “I am so lonely” – most of the population of the planet Earth have said such things to themselves or out loud, I am sure. Considering the fact, that by 2010 the population had reached 7 billion people, it would be fair to say, that the issues and problems of understanding (or misunderstanding) and, consequently, loneliness, searching for the meaning of life, communication, relationship comfort, make up one of the most important life landmarks in the modern world. The problem of understanding is key in the current scientific picture. [4] Psychology, political science, law, ethics, cultural studies, philosophy offer their points of view on this phenomenon, as well as their solutions to its problems.

2 Methodology

Theoretical interpretation of understanding of problem of individual understanding in the context of globalization requires an integrated approach.

The inclusion of the phenomenon of social understanding in the broad context of individual and collective worldview creativity, the assertion of the social nature of personal identity and the principles of the personalistic interpretation of this phenomenon, - this complex of mutually complementary fundamental ideas and positions will be the starting point for the development of the author's understanding of public and individual communication. [5]

The basis of the socio-philosophical study of the problems of interpersonal understanding and the role of machine-to-machine communications in it is made up of the following main provisions: consideration of the problem of understanding based on the use of an activity of person in the analysis of informational phenomena; research of material and spiritual dialectics, recognition of the relative independence of public consciousness and its increasing role as a pattern of history; the doctrine of the forms of social consciousness. [6] Solving the tasks, the authors are relied on an extensive and versatile material: historical-philosophical, cultural, psychological, literary.

3 Results

3.1 The problem of understanding in the history of philosophy

In my opinion, the problem of understanding is closely connected with the issue of everyday life. The problem of everyday life is a «new» topic in the scientific picture of the world, if I may say so. The everyday life phenomenon is one of the issues which appeared and has been developed as part of the well-known anthropological turn, than began in humanities in the early 1960s.

However the first to pay attention to the problem of everyday life was the famous German philosopher, the founder of phenomenology, Edmund Husserl. Working on the problem of the crisis in European philosophy and European method of thinking, Husserl introduced the notion of the «life world», which became central in his later philosophy. Husserl drew attention to the importance of the fact that philosophical reflections and abstractions can concern not only higher intelligible ideas, but the real, practical sphere of the «human mundanity», which is so widely discussed now, as well. [7]

Husserl's follower, Alfred Schütz developed several ideas of his teacher. He showed that Husserl's «life world» was nothing but reality, and any person is constantly involved in this reality, using in his behavior various standards and patterns, that seem obvious to him.

According to Schütz, everyday life, or the everyday life-world is the part of this reality, which a person can influence and change with his actions.

The next landmark in considering the everyday life phenomenon as a separate branch of scientific knowledge was the theory of the social construction of reality by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann. Berger and Luckmann are the first to see the everyday life phenomenon in direct relation to the social interaction of people. According to the scholars, these interactions are the content of our everyday life, therefore there arises the need to study the language of these interactions (*the problem of understanding* - italics supplied, E.P.), and to work out the typical models which can be revealed in the process of human communication, etc. Herewith the scholars emphasize that language, which can be defined as a system of word signs, is the most important sign system of human society.

In general, arguing about the nature of everyday life Berger and Luckmann come to the conclusion that: «Reality of everyday life... exists as self-evident and insurmountable factuality. Although I may have doubts about its reality, I must abstain from them... This abstention from doubts is so rigid, that in order to give it up... I need to make a sharp leap... to make a great effort». [8] The ideas of Clifford Geertz represent another important step in the studies of everyday life. His «interpretative» anthropology showed everyday life as a standard human activity filled with symbols, metaphors, which eventually make up a complex network of hierarchical structures giving the basis to the whole culture.

One of the most outstanding members of the Annals school Fernand Braudel introduced a new term – «the structures of everyday life». The scholar defined them as everything that surrounds people in life – geographical and environmental conditions, all social institutes, interpersonal communication (economic, legal, cultural, political etc.). Braudel's ultimate priority was the search of some «invariant», i.e. a certain constant, which is present in everyday life of the whole analyzed specific historical epoch.

Even this short historical outline shows variety of ways to study the issue of everyday life. Indeed, we are confined to our everyday life, whether we like it or not. Moreover, we are confined not in the context of Heidegger's thrownness, but, just like in the above mentioned phenomenon, we depend on the place, the time and the country of our origin. In my opinion, the difference lies in the fact, that Heidegger shows sharpness of this thrownness, which becomes especially evident in his «limit situations», he emphasizes senselessness of the superficial, but at acute, radical moments of human life; and in the aspect of everyday life the same sharpness and acuteness are blurred in the loge sequence of days, weeks, months and years. That is, if nothing extraordinary happens in our life (e.g. a fatal disease), we can live quietly and peacefully, we only exist, raising our head once in a while and saying: «my life is gone», «I haven't had enough time to do this or that», «I haven't said this or that» etc. In our opinion, the problems of the «ordinary person's» life are closely connected with characteristic features of our time and the modern world.

The notion of understanding as the basic foundation of modern hermeneutics can be found in the works of the medieval philosopher Augustine of Hippo. Augustine was the first to define the notion of understanding as a simple transformation of sign into its meaning. However, being a religious philosopher, Augustine mentioned a very interesting fact: it turns out, that we can perceive the meaning only due to the fact that various images of the signs around us are imprinted in our soul.

In the seventeen centuries Friedrich Schleiermacher, theologian, philosopher, and biblical scholar tried to construct new, universal hermeneutics. In his considerations Schleiermacher comes to conclusion that there are at least two methods of understanding (historical and divinatory), as well as its two sides (subjective and objective). [9] At the same time the two sides and two methods of understanding are intertwined with each other, creating a complex unity. Moreover, according to the philosopher, in order to reach understanding you need constant methodical efforts against universal misunderstanding that occurs «as a matter of

course». [9] However well developed the phenomenon in question seems to be, understanding still remains only the problem of detailed working out of different interpretational ways and methods that lead to understanding. [10]

The problem of understanding receives its actual philosophical status only in the theory of Wilhelm Dilthey. It was possible due to the fact that Dilthey was the first to make a sharp division between the so-called “human sciences” and the natural sciences. [11] According to Dilthey, the phenomenon of understanding was the methodological content of the human sciences, whereas hermeneutics is the logic of the latter.

And, finally, the problem of understanding became a purely independent philosophical issue (not part of some approach, school or trend) in philosophy of the 20th century. [12] If we think of philosophers-analysts’ main ideas, we should say that initially the ultimate priority of analytical philosophy was to create an ideal language, i.e. the language using and including only the sentences and assertions, which reflect only the real state of affairs in the world. They are: Moritz Schlick’s «protocol statements», Rudolf Carnap’s «predicate calculations», «existing facts» in the early works of Ludwig Wittgenstein. In general, the problem of understanding is developed as «following the rules» in the analytical approach. On the contrary, hermeneutic-phenomenological approach develops traditional range of problems (Augustinian) on the one hand, and uses the whole possible potential of phenomenology on the other. As part of the phenomenological tradition, at least two opposite points of view can be found.

One approach sees consciousness as a supra-individual structure of the whole culture, sociality, where all separate consciousnesses are born and live as an «after-product». This point of view is colorfully represented in Gustav Shpet’s work «Consciousness and Its Proprietor». Shpet writes: «Nobody «owns» or «possesses» the unity of consciousness, because it can’t be owned or possessed, it is purely the unity of consciousness, i.e. self-consciousness. So who owns consciousness? – It’s free, it belongs to itself! So, in other words, it belongs to nobody!». [13]

Thus, we have a very interesting situation. According to this approach, we just *can’t* (italics supplied, E.P.) face the problem of misunderstanding, as both I and Another person are in the same cloud of intersubjective, supra-individual consciousness. We are doomed to understanding, everywhere and always, moreover, our personal understanding is in advance, a priori determined to be true. So, if we don’t understand Another person, he loses his status of Another person, and it transferred to the class of inferior creatures, that don’t belong to the common socio-cultural cloud of Shpet’s consciousness.

The opposite of this approach is another strategy, according to which we are initially implanted in the world, that is we are deprived of participation in general structures of consciousness. This strategy is presented in the works of Martin Heidegger. In my opinion, Heidegger sees the problem of understanding in a very interesting way. He starts with text analysis. According to his point of view, to understand the text doesn’t mean to hit that very point of meaning expressed by the author. And to understand the text means to unfold *your own* thoughts on the basis of this text. [14]

Is it possible to make our communication with Another person, our interpersonal communication clear and open, without transferred senses, undertones of meanings and pluralism of interpretations? I don’t know, but I could try to explain my point of view, my forecast for the future society based on information systems. In my opinion, information communication systems created by people are the ideal communication model for the future society. Further I will try to justify my position. But at first I would like to outline the current situation in scientific world concerning dichotomy “human being – machine”.

3.2 The role and necessity of information technology in society: discussions and debates

The cybernetics, computer, IT phenomenon is rather new; it is only a few dozen years old. And from the moment of emergence of the first computer (1939, Germany), till the creation of huge artificial intermachine communications supercomplexes, the mankind took a huge step in development of this sphere thanks to which we can today, figuratively speaking, place the whole world history of mankind into the tiny data carrier which is of size of a child's palm. [15] Cybernetics, programming, creation of artificial intelligence are developing so fast that it provokes a whole range of different points of view, evaluations of what is taking place.

For example, there are two main opinions as whether development of computer technologies are a good or bad thing. One opinion is the unconditional approval of this development. [16] Indeed, it is impossible to imagine the modern world without IT industry. Unlimited opportunities the cyberspace opens to us are really unique. You can visit any museum of the world without leaving your house, order some food, medicine, cosmetics, services staying at home again, lots of social networks, such as Facebook and Tweeter, let us communicate with an unlimited number of people: the range of opportunities is endless! We admire the latest gadgets such as a robot-vacuum cleaner that can clean the flat on its own, and a man-like android that can play chess and solve logical tasks. Modern possibilities of information technologies in education allow to study at any university of the world using remote systems of training. [17]

Representatives of the opposite approach warn us against the growing power of information technologies. [18] At the beginning of the 20th century a famous Russian immigrant philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev wrote: "What is the biggest danger of machines for people? Machines and technology cause awful damage to the soul of a person, especially to emotions and feelings. Machine, technical civilization is dangerous first of all for the soul. A heart can hardly bear the touch of cold metal; it cannot live in metal environment". [19]

Another famous French philosopher Jean Baudrillard describes the current situation even harsher: "If people create "clever" machines, they do it because they are secretly disappointed with the mind of their own... if people dream of original and "genius" machines, it is because they are disappointed with their identity or prefer to refuse from it and use machines that would function between them". [20]

3.3 Informational communication VS interpersonal communication

Thus, whereas cyberneticists, programmers, scientists developing IT- and nanotechnology, as well as generation of consumers, who feel so comfortable in the world of everlasting technical upgrade, see tomorrow optimistically, the thinking and reasoning part of scientific world has another opinion. Political scientists, culture scientists, philosophers express both doubts, uncertainty because of the growing power of information technologies, and harsh criticism of the current situation in the modern information world. Considering these issues, my point of view concerning the problem of information technologies may seem rather paradoxical, as I represent philosophic community. A reader, skipping through the article may say: «Oh, please, what do you want? Are you reducing the versatile and unique world of human relationships to the machine?»

Yes, I must agree, that information transfer between machines and between people are two different processes, because the world of people is purely subjective in comparison with machines, machines don't fall in love, they just send and receive information. And to put the world of human communication on a par with machine systems means to reduce the versatile human world to the simplified scheme of data transfer. However, it should be noted that «machine communication» has greatly developed from the time it was created till the present

moment. And comparing the rich world of the modern human interaction with the principles of 20-year-old machine communication is one thing. But if we compare this interaction with the modern computer communication, then we will get a better picture. [21]

We have to note one important thing. People improve PC communication to make it more suitable for interpersonal interaction. And such development is moving on. Today we are able to transfer such amounts of information that seemed fantastic some thirty years ago. We are able to download films, music, books, we can communicate “live”, that is seeing and hearing our partner – it all is everyday reality now thanks to the new ultramodern programs.

We also don't claim that it is necessary to shrink the whole live and versatile world of human communication to the poor and simplified machine communication world. It is simply not real. But we've never mentioned that it is necessary. The point of our article is to give a future forecast.

The matter is that at the very beginning of information technologies emergence it was still possible to follow their similarity to information transfer among people, as well as a little time later, by the way. [22] But today, when information systems development is going with great strides, we've lost possibility to compare communication among people and among machines, because our (human, interpersonal) communication still remain at the same level on which the first machine communications were based. [23] Metaphorically speaking, our interpersonal communication, in my opinion, is still at the primitive prehistorical level, whereas computer communications have gone far ahead. But here is the paradox: it was us, people, who taught computers interact with each other (exchange information), proceeding from OUR ideas and OUR cognitive-intellectual potential. In other words, the complex modern algorithms used by machines to transfer information were created by people, who couldn't have made something they weren't capable of.

Let's say, since the creation of the first computers one of the main, perspective tasks put before engineers consisted in development of such hardware-software complex which would allow machines, than can store and process data, to transfer these data to other machines correctly and adequately. The main problem the researchers faced was that information transferred from one PC to another, either didn't reach the destination at all, or, having reached the destination, it turned out to be absolutely different from what had been transferred. Having created some PCs algorithms based on the engineers' ideas of information transfer, the engineers faced the necessity to improve those algorithms, based on certain ideas again.

Thus, development of intermachine communication took place thanks to complication of information transfer algorithms, and the algorithms became more and more complicated thanks to the complication of ideas of high-quality communication principles. And now, if we transfer these thoughts into the area of philosophical ideas and intensions, we can conclude the following. When the first programmers were working on the problem of information transfer form one machine to another, they unwittingly made revolution in the possible approach to interpersonal communication.[24] (Here we need to make a brief digression. In the modern world the so-called computer «hominization» is getting more and more popular. We can often hear: «the processor froze – it's dead», «It (the computer) doesn't want do what I say!» «It doesn't understand what I want». Such phrases indicate the long-time wish of people – to make the incomprehensible world clearer, hence to see a computer as a friend, interesting, naughty and so on.

And now, if we transfer these thoughts into the area of philosophical ideas and intensions, we can conclude the following. When the first programmers were working on the problem of information transfer form one machine to another, they unwittingly made revolution in the possible approach to interpersonal communication.

(Here we need to make a brief digression. In the modern world the so-called computer “hominization” is getting more and more popular. We can often hear: “the processor froze –

it's dead", "It (the computer) doesn't want do what I say!" "It doesn't understand what I want". Such phrases indicate the long-time wish of people – to make the incomprehensible world clearer, hence to see a computer as a friend, interesting, naughty and so on.

However, we, ordinary people, the homo ordinaries, always forget that computer (as well as any other work of human thought and labor) was created by PEOPLE, with all their ideas of what is good and what is bad, and that it is good to transfer information correctly and adequately, and it is bad to misrepresent and confuse data. We forget that though PC is clever, but it is just a machine created by people to solve certain tasks). A now I will return to my idea again. So, I believe that humanity has already found solution to the problem of understanding, not realizing it yet. In my opinion, turning to the principles basic for information transfer in technical information systems, could become the ideal model of communication for the society of the future.

Moreover, in my point of view, ideal information models have a common characteristic feature, which distinguishes them from any other spheres of scientific knowledge. Development of information technologies is not directed to research of the real objective world, society or personality, as it happens in ALL other scientific branches and fields. Let's take quantum physics, for example. We could argue that this sphere of scientific knowledge studies not the real world, but some particles, whose existence in the physical world hasn't been proved yet. However, we suppose, that this statement is false, because any new hypothesis about the world is always grounded on the existing physical picture of the world, which is formed on the basis of observations and experiments in this physical world.

However, when we study communication, we observe the phenomena, which happen due to people's ideas of how information should be transferred. Thus, this science represents the notions of information transfer and makes it possible to check these notions, develop them and create new ones, being that way a peculiar standard or ideal model of the future interpersonal communications.

4 Discussion

The discussion nature of the work is related to the specifics of its object, object and purpose and is determined by the nature of its tasks. The work is aimed at systematization, deepening and refining of modern philosophical knowledge about the essence of inter-personal understanding in modern world in the conditions of globalization. [25]

The work adjoins the main thematic areas developed within the domestic and foreign schools dealing with the phenomenon of inter-personal understanding in modern society and is the result of many years of the author's work on the problems of theory, practice and methodology of socio-philosophical problems of culture and society.

Thus, whereas cyberneticists, programmers, scientists developing IT- and nanotechnology, as well as generation of consumers, who feel so comfortable in the world of everlasting technical upgrade, see tomorrow optimistically, the thinking and reasoning part of scientific world has another opinion. Political scientists, culture scientists, philosophers express both doubts, uncertainty because of the growing power if information technologies, and harsh criticism of the current situation in the modern information world.

5 Conclusion

The society is constantly self-improving. It happens so because there are some defects in the society that prevent people from living comfortably. The society, socialization are the most necessary things in life of any person. But development of a society occurs today without direct participation of people. Neither progress nor a developing society depend on a separate person. However society progress is obvious - the state, ideologies, process of welfare.

Moreover, in our point of view, ideal information models have a common characteristic feature, which distinguishes them from any other spheres of scientific knowledge. Development of information technologies is not directed to research of the real objective world, society or personality, as it happens in ALL other scientific branches and fields.

Let's take quantum physics, for example. We could argue that this sphere of scientific knowledge studies not the real world, but some particles, whose existence in the physical world hasn't been proved yet. However, we suppose, that this statement is false, because any new hypothesis about the world is always grounded on the existing physical picture of the world, which is formed on the basis of observations and experiments in this physical world.

However, when we study communication, we observe the phenomena, which happen due to people's ideas of how information should be transferred. Thus, this science represents the notions of information transfer and makes it possible to check these notions, develop them and create new ones, being that way a peculiar standard or ideal model of the future interpersonal communications.

Yes, our knowledge is imperfect also we can't embrace the unembraceable. But the person wouldn't be the person if he didn't aspire to the impossible. To learn and understand the unknown, to improve the knowledge are those purposes for the sake of which it is necessary to live and which presence distinguishes us from animals.

We realize that the given subject isn't completely settled by the present research. Consideration of its various sides demands partnership of experts of various profiles, efforts of the subsequent researchers in its further profound disclosing.

References

1. P. Snowdon, Personal Identity: Complex or Simple? *Philosophical Review*. **124**, 3 (2015)
2. A. Alexandrova, Can the Science of Well-Being Be Objective? *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, **69**, 2 (2018)
3. S. Huntington, *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. (USA. Touchstone. 1997)
4. I. Paliy, H. Pavlova, Global society of the XXI century: self-organization or self-destruction? The problem of collective intelligence in the evolution of human culture and civilization. *17th International Scientific Conference Globalization and Its Socio-Economic Consequences University of Zilina, The Faculty of Operation and Economics of Transport and Communications, Department of Economics 4th – 5th October 2017*. (2017)
5. T. Shchedrina, The Problem of Understanding of Historical Reality
6. (Gustav Shpet's Methodological Experience) *Voprosy Filosofii*. **12** (2018)
7. J. Dewhurst, Individuation without Representation. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, **69**, 1 (2018)
8. E. Husserl, *Philosophy as Exact Science*. (Russia. Moscow. LKI. 1994)
9. P. Berger, T. Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality. Treatise on Sociology of Knowledge*. Russia. Moscow. Medium. (1995)
10. F. Schleiermacher, *Hermeneutics and criticism. And other writings*. (UK. CUP. 1998)
11. B. Feintzeig, Toward an Understanding of Parochial Observables *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, **69** (2018)
12. W. Dilthey, *Introduction to Human Sciences. Experience of Grounding the Studies of Society and History*. (USA. PUP. 1991)

13. J. Robert, G. Williams, Nonclassical Minds and Indeterminate Survival. (2014)
14. *Philosophical Review* **123**,4 (2014)
15. G. Shpet, Philosophical studies. (Russia. Moscow. Progress. 1994)
16. M. Heidegger, Being and Time. (USA. State University of New York. 1996)
17. W. Bechtel, Analysing Network Models to Make Discoveries about Biological Mechanisms. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* **7**. (2019)
18. L. Sporer, V. Hauch, Does Training Improve the Detection of Deception? A Meta-Analysis. *Communication Research* **43**, 3 (2016)
19. S. Berstler, What's the Good of Language? On the Moral Distinction between Lying and Misleading. *Ethics* **130**, 1 (2019)
20. C. Heeney, An "Ethical Moment" in Data Sharing. *Science, Technology, & Human Values* **42**, 1 (2017)
21. N. Berdyaev, Man and Machine. The Problem of Sociology and Technology Metaphysics // *Voprosy Filosofii*. **2** (1989)
22. J. Baudrillard, *The Intelligence of Evil*. (UK. Bloomsbury Academic. 2013)
23. J. Brown, "Additive Value and the Shape of a Life" *Ethics* **130**, 1 (2019)
24. B. Perry, The Social Life of "Scaffolds": Examining Human Rights in Regenerative Medicine. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*. **43**, 1 (2018)
25. S. Shoemaker, Self-Knowledge for Humans. *Philosophical Review* **125**, 4 (2016)
26. R. Tukachinsky, N. Walter, Meta-Analytic Examination of the Continued Influence of Misinformation in the Face of Correction: How Powerful Is It, Why Does It Happen, and How to Stop It? *Communication Research*. Article first published online: June 22, 2019
27. S. Ranganathan, Global Commons. *European journal of international law*. **2** (2016)